

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 11/19/2003, Claims 2 and 9 were cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 14-16 were rejected as being anticipated by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected as being obvious over the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 5-7, 12-13 and 17-18 were objected to, but were further indicated as being allowable.

In response, Applicant has submitted the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 8 and 14 to overcome the Examiner's objection.

For the reasons set forth below, reconsideration of the rejections is requested and allowance of the present application is submitted to be in order.

Patentability of Claims 1, 8 and 14 (as proposed amended)

Applicant has made amendment to these claims to further clarify the differences between them and Clarke and Siems (U.S. Patent No. 5,690,419). As is depicted clearly in Applicant's figure 4, Applicant's "annular face" is a ring-shaped surface (i.e. its surface forms a ring around a generally central opening). Claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended to limit these claims to such a design. Clearly, the Clarke design, even if given substantial latitude in its interpretation, discloses its bore at the center of its dome-shaped element. Clarke fails to disclose even a single threaded bore into an annular face (i.e. a ring-shaped surface) of its dome-shaped element.

Furthermore, the Siems "Optical Reflector Mounting Assembly" fails to disclose a "ball dome member" having a ring-shaped annular face attached to a light housing. In fact,

the Siems device seems to incorporate a ball-shaped element 14 into the light housing member 12. Applicant further respectfully asserts that making the rejection of Claims 8, 10 and 11 final in view of Siems was premature, in view of the fact that it was a new ground for rejection, and Siems was not a reference previously relied upon by the Examiner. Regardless, as amended, it seems clear that the Siems device is not even analogous to Applicant's claimed invention, since there is no indication that there are any similarities in the two devices beyond the fact that both relate to light housings. Since the Examiner has not provided support for his rejection (beyond citing §103), Applicant is unable to attempt to address the Examiner's issues. Hopefully, in view of Applicant's proposed amendments, any alleged conflict with Siems has been overcome, and the Examiner will conclude that the rejections based upon this reference should be withdrawn.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the independent claims are allowable over the cited references, and that the §102 and §103 rejections have been overcome. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the reason that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.¹


¹ 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and the case passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of the claims remains after consideration of this request for reconsideration, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINS & ASSOCIATES



Karl M. Steins
Registration No. 40,186
2333 Camino del Rio South
Suite 120
San Diego, California 92108
Telephone: (619) 692-2004
Facsimile: (619) 692-2003